

Elizabeth Fegan, Esq.
HAGENS BERMAN SOBOL SHAPIRO LLP
60 W. Randolph Street, Suite 200
Chicago, IL 60601
Telephone: (312) 762-9235
Facsimile: (312) 762-9286

Marc H. Edelson, Esq.
HOFFMAN & EDELSON
45 West Court Street
Doylestown, PA 18901
Telephone: (215) 230-8043
Facsimile: (215) 230-8735

Kenneth A. Wexler, Esq.
WEXLER TORISEVA WALLACE LLP
One North LaSalle Street, Suite 2000
Chicago, IL 60602
Telephone: (312) 346-2222
Facsimile: (312) 346-0022

Eugene A. Spector, Esq.
Jeffrey L. Kodroff, Esq.
John A. Macoretta, Esq.
SPECTOR, ROSEMAN & KODROFF, P.C.
1818 Market Street, Suite 2500
Philadelphia, PA 19103
Telephone: (215) 496-0300
Facsimile: (215) 496-6611

ON BEHALF OF DEFENDANTS

By /s/ Nicholas C. Theodorou
Nicholas C. Theodorou, Esq. (BBO# 496730)
Katherine B. Schmeckpeper, Esq. (BBO# 663200)
FOLEY HOAG, LLP
155 Seaport Boulevard
Boston, MA 02210

DATED: July 2, 2007

D. Scott Wise, Esq. (admitted *pro hac vice*)
Michael Flynn, Esq. (admitted *pro hac vice*)
Kimberley Harris, Esq. (admitted *pro hac vice*)

DAVIS POLK & WARDWELL

450 Lexington Avenue
New York, NY 10017

Attorneys for Defendant AstraZeneca
Pharmaceuticals LP

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that I, Thomas M. Sobol, an attorney, caused a true and correct copy of the foregoing **Status Report** to be delivered to all counsel of record by electronic service pursuant to Paragraph 11 of the Case Management Order No. 2, by sending on July 2, 2007, a copy to LexisNexis File & Serve for posting and notification to all parties.

/s/ **Thomas M. Sobol**

Thomas M. Sobol, Esq.

HAGENS BERMAN SOBOL SHAPIRO LLP

One Main Street, 4th Floor

Cambridge, MA 02142

Telephone: (617) 482-3700

Facsimile: (617) 482-3003

MDL 1456 STATUS CHART – GOVERNMENT ENTITY CASES

GOVERNMENT ENTITY CASES	MDL DOCKET NUMBER	ORIGINAL JURISDICTION	STATUS
Montana v. Abbott Labs., Inc. et al.	02-CV-12084-PBS	Removed to D. Mont.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • December 7, 2005 – Defendants’ Emergency Motion for an Order Holding Plaintiffs in Contempt, for Preservation of Potentially Relevant Documents, and for an Accounting of Spoliated Documents (re: Montana and Nevada) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ December 7, 2005 – Defendants’ Motion for Expedited Briefing Schedule and Oral Argument on Defendants’ Motion for an Order Holding Plaintiffs in Contempt, for Preservation of Potentially Relevant Documents, and for an Accounting of Spoliated Documents ○ December 8, 2005 – Opposition of the States of Nevada and Montana to Defendants’ Motion for Expedited Briefing Schedule and Oral Argument on Defendants’ Motion for an Order Holding Plaintiffs in Contempt, for Preservation of Potentially Relevant Documents, and for an Accounting of Spoliated Documents ○ December 12, 2005 – Defendants’ Motion for Leave to File Reply Memorandum in Support of Motion Expedited Briefing Schedule and Oral Argument on Defendants’ Motion for an Order Holding Plaintiffs in Contempt, for Preservation of Potentially Relevant Documents, and for an Accounting of Spoliated Documents ○ December 15, 2005 – Opposition of the States of Nevada and Montana to Defendants’ Motion for Leave to File Reply Memorandum in Support of Motion Expedited Briefing Schedule and Oral Argument on Defendants’ Motion for an Order Holding Plaintiffs in Contempt, for Preservation of Potentially Relevant Documents, and for an Accounting of Spoliated Documents ○ December 21, 2005 – Opposition of the States of Nevada and Montana to Defendants’ Motion for an Order Holding Plaintiffs in Contempt, for Preservation of Potentially Relevant Documents, and for an Accounting of Spoliated Documents ○ January 6, 2006 – Defendants’ Motion for Leave to File a Reply Brief in Support of Their Emergency Motion for an Order Holding Plaintiffs in Contempt, for Preservation of Potentially Relevant Documents, and for an Accounting of Spoliated Documents ○ January 6, 2006 – Defendants’ Reply Brief in Support of Their Emergency Motion for an Order Holding Plaintiffs in Contempt, for Preservation of Potentially Relevant Documents, and for an Accounting of Spoliated Documents ○ January 11, 2006 – Opposition of the States of Nevada and Montana to Defendants’ Motion for Leave to File a Reply Brief in Support of Their Emergency Motion for an Order Holding Plaintiffs in Contempt for Preservation of Potentially Relevant Documents and for an Accounting of Spoliated Documents

GOVERNMENT ENTITY CASES	MDL DOCKET NUMBER	ORIGINAL JURISDICTION	STATUS
<p>Montana v. Abbott Labs., Inc. et al. (continued)</p>			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <p>• February 8, 2007 – Defendants’ Joint Motion for Summary Judgment (<i>individual motions filed by Abbott Laboratories, AstraZeneca Pharmaceuticals LP, Aventis Pharmaceuticals, Inc., Bayer Corp., BMS, Immunex Corp., Johnson & Johnson, Novartis Pharmaceuticals Corp., Pfizer & Pharmacia, Schering-Plough Corp. & Warrick Pharmaceuticals, Sicor, Inc. and TAP Pharmaceutical Prods., Inc.</i>) (<i>individual memorandum in support of Joint Motion filed by Fujisawa</i>)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ February 9, 2007 – Defendant AstraZeneca Pharmaceuticals LP’s Motion for Leave to File Certain Documents Under Seal ○ March 22, 2007 – Montana’s Opposition to Defendants’ Joint Motion for Summary Judgment ○ April 5, 2007 – Defendants’ Joint Reply in Further Support of Their Motion for Summary Judgment ○ April 5, 2007 – Defendants’ Joint Motion to Strike the Declaration of Dorothy Poulsen Submitted in Support of State of Montana’s Opposition to Defendants’ Joint Motion for Summary Judgment <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ April 25, 2007 – Montana and Nevada’s Joint Opposition to Defendants’ Motions to Strike the Declarations of Dorothy Poulsen, Charles Duarte and Coleen Lawrence ▪ May 2, 2007 – Reply in Further Support of Defendants’ Joint Motion to Strike the Declaration of Dorothy Poulsen ○ April 26, 2007 – Montana’s Opposition to Individual Defendants’ Motion for Summary Judgment ○ May 10, 2007 – Individual Defendants’ Reply in Further Support of Their Motions for Summary Judgment (<i>replies filed by AstraZeneca Pharmaceuticals, Aventis Pharmaceuticals, Inc., Bayer Corp., Fujisawa, Immunex Corp., Johnson & Johnson, Novartis Pharmaceuticals Corp., Pfizer, Inc., and Schering-Plough & Warrick Pharmaceuticals</i>) <p>• February 8, 2007 – The State of Montana’s Motion for Partial Summary Judgment Against Certain Defendants</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ March 22, 2007 – Defendants’ Joint Opposition to the State of Montana’s Motion for Partial Summary Judgment Against Certain Defendants (<i>individual motions filed by Abbott, Pfizer, and Pharmacia; AstraZeneca; Aventis Behring, LLC.; Aventis Pharmaceuticals, Inc.; Bayer Corp; Fujisawa; Immunex Corp.; Johnson & Johnson; Novartis Pharmaceuticals Corp.; Schering-Plough Corp. & Warrick Pharmaceuticals; Sicor Inc.; TAP Pharmaceutical Prods., Inc; ZLB Behring LLC</i>) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ March 22, 2007 – Defendant AstraZeneca Pharmaceuticals LP’s Motion for Leave to File Certain Documents Under Seal

GOVERNMENT ENTITY CASES	MDL DOCKET NUMBER	ORIGINAL JURISDICTION	STATUS
Montana v. Abbott Labs., Inc. et al. (continued)			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> February 8, 2007 – Defendants’ Motion that Court Suggest Transfer of the Montana and Nevada Cases to Their Federal Courts of Origin (re: Montana and Nevada) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> February 22, 2007 – Plaintiffs’ Memorandum in Opposition to Defendants’ Motion Suggesting Transfer of Cases to Federal Courts of Origin June 21, 2007 – Plaintiffs’ Motion to Continue the Stay, with Baxter’s Consent and with Respect to Defendant Baxter Healthcare Corporation and Baxter International Inc. Only, the Class Case and Montana and Nevada Cases June 28, 2007 – Motion for Dismissal of Dey, Inc.
Nevada v. American Home Products, Inc. et al (“Nevada II”)	02-CV-12086-PBS	Removed to D. Nev.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> December 7, 2005 – Defendants’ Emergency Motion for an Order Holding Plaintiffs in Contempt, for Preservation of Potentially Relevant Documents, and for an Accounting of Spoliated Documents (re: Montana and Nevada, see entry under <i>Montana v. Abbott Labs., Inc. et al.</i>) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> July 21, 2006 – Nevada II Defendants’ Joint Memorandum in Support of Defendants’ Joint Motion for Redress for Spoliation of Evidence (<i>Nevada Only</i>) August 4, 2006 – State of Nevada’s Opposition to Defendants’ Joint Motion for Redress for Spoliation of Evidence August 14, 2006 – Defendants’ Joint Motion for Leave to File a Reply to Nevada’s Opposition to Defendants’ Joint Motion for Redress for Spoliation of Evidence (reply memorandum attached) April 6, 2007 – Bayer’s Motion for Clarification of One Aspect of the Court’s March 26, 2007 Order February 8, 2007 – Defendants’ Joint Motion for Summary Judgment (<i>individual motions filed by AstraZeneca Pharmaceuticals, Aventis Pharmaceuticals, Inc., Immunex Corp., Johnson & Johnson, Novartis Pharmaceuticals Corp., Pfizer, Inc., Schering-Plough & Warrick Pharmaceuticals and Sicor, Inc.</i>) (<i>individual memorandum in support of Joint Motion filed by Fujisawa</i>) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> March 22, 2007 – State of Nevada’s Opposition to Defendants’ Joint Motion for Summary Judgment April 5, 2007 – Defendants’ Joint Reply in Further Support of Their Motion for Summary Judgment April 5, 2007 – Defendants’ Joint Motion to Strike the Declarations of Charles Duarte and Coleen Lawrence Submitted in Support of State of Nevada’s Opposition to Defendants’ Joint Motion for Summary Judgment <ul style="list-style-type: none"> April 25, 2007 – Montana and Nevada’s Joint Opposition to Defendants’ Motions to Strike the Declarations of Dorothy Poulsen, Charles Duarte and Coleen

GOVERNMENT ENTITY CASES	MDL DOCKET NUMBER	ORIGINAL JURISDICTION	STATUS
Nevada v. American Home Products, Inc. et al (continued)			<p>Lawrence</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> May 2, 2007 – Joint Reply in Further Support of Defendants’ Joint Motion to Strike the Declarations of Charles Duarte and Coleen Lawrence April 26, 2007 – Nevada’s Opposition to Individual Defendants’ Motion for Summary Judgment May 10, 2007 – Individual Defendants’ Replies in Further Support of Their Motions for Summary Judgment (<i>replies filed by AstraZeneca Pharmaceuticals, Aventis Pharmaceuticals, Inc., Fujisawa, Immunex Corp., Johnson & Johnson, Novartis Pharmaceuticals Corp., and Schering-Plough & Warrick Pharmaceuticals</i>) February 8, 2007 – Defendants’ Motion that Court Suggest Transfer of the Montana and Nevada Cases to Their Federal Courts of Origin (re: Montana and Nevada, see entry under <i>Montana v. Abbott Labs., Inc. et al.</i>)
State of Nevada v. Dey, Inc., et al., Case No. 3:06-539	n/a	Removed to D. Nev.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> November 28, 2006 – Final Transfer Order (33) transferring <i>State of Nevada v. Dey, Inc., et al.</i>, D. Nev., Case No. 3:06-539, to D. Mass.
California ex rel. Ven-A-Care of the Florida Keys, Inc. v. Abbott Labs., Inc. et al.	03-CV-11226-PBS	Removed to C.D. Cal.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> January 17, 2006 – Defendant ZLB Behring LLC's Individual Memorandum of Law in Support of Defendants' Motion to Dismiss the First Amended Complaint <ul style="list-style-type: none"> March 2, 2006 – Plaintiffs’ Memorandum in Opposition to Defendant ZLB Behring, LLC’s Individual Motion to Dismiss the First Amended Complaint April 3, 2006 - Reply in Support of Defendant ZLB Behring LLCs Individual Memorandum of Law in Support of Defendants Motion to Dismiss the First Amended Complaint-in-Intervention April 17, 2006 – Plaintiffs’ Sur-Reply to Defendants’ Joint and Individual Motions to Dismiss the First Amended Complaint February 13, 2006 – Boehringer Ingelheim Pharmaceuticals, Inc.’s Motion to Dismiss and Joinder in Defendants’ Motion to Dismiss the First Amended Complaint-In-Intervention <ul style="list-style-type: none"> April 3, 2006 – Separate Reply in Support of Defendants’ Joint Motion to Dismiss the First Amended Complaint in Intervention of Boehringer Ingelheim Pharmaceuticals, Inc. and Boehringer Ingelheim Corporation April 11, 2006 – Notice of Proposed Case Management Order Pursuant to the Court’s March 16, 2006 Ruling April 28, 2006 – Stipulated Motion for Order Permitting Deposition of Harvey Weintraub (former Warrick Vice President)

GOVERNMENT ENTITY CASES	MDL DOCKET NUMBER	ORIGINAL JURISDICTION	STATUS
California <i>ex rel.</i> Ven-A-Care of the Florida Keys, Inc. v. Abbott Labs., Inc. et al. (continued)			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> July 26, 2006 – Plaintiffs’ Motion for Leave to File Supplemental Submission in Response to the Court’s Request for Claims Examples (submission attached) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> August 4, 2006 – Defendants’ Opposition to Plaintiffs’ Motion for Leave to File Supplemental Submission in Response to the Court’s Request for Claims Examples September 12, 2006 – Plaintiffs’ Supplemental Submission in Response to the Court’s Request for Claims Examples October 5, 2006 – Defendants’ Unopposed Motion for Leave to File a Response to Plaintiffs’ Supplemental Submission in Response to the Court’s Request for Claims Examples (reply attached) June 26, 2007 – Joint Motion for Entry of [Proposed] Case Management Order
Ven-A-Care of the Florida Keys, et al. v. Abbott Laboratories, Inc., et al., Case No. 1:06-21303	n/a	S.D. Fla.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> July 11, 2006 – Conditional Transfer Order (30) transferring <i>Ven-A-Care of the Florida Keys, Inc., et al. v. Abbott Laboratories, Inc., et al.</i>, S.D. Fla., Case No. 1:06-21303, to D. Mass. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> July 26, 2006 – No Notice of Opposition filed January 24, 2007 – Plaintiffs’ “Notice to the Court of Motion Fully Briefed” <ul style="list-style-type: none"> January 25, 2007 - Abbott Laboratories, Inc.’s Opposition to Plaintiffs’ “Notice to the Court of Motion Fully Briefed” March 28, 2007 – Abbott Laboratories, Inc.’s Renewed Motion to Compel Evidence Withheld Under the Deliberative Process Privileged <ul style="list-style-type: none"> April 20, 2007 - United States’ Opposition to Defendant Abbott Laboratories, Inc.’s Renewed Motion to Compel Evidence Withheld Under the Deliberative Process Privilege April 27, 2007 – Relators’ Motion to Compel Abbott Laboratories, Inc. to Produce of Consent to Access to and Sharing of All Discovery Produced by Abbott in Other False Price Report Litigation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> May 14, 2007 – Defendant Abbott Laboratories Inc.’s Response in Opposition to Relator’s Motion to Compel to Produce or Consent to Access to All Discovery Produced in Other False Price Report Litigation May 1, 2007 – Abbott Laboratories, Inc.’s Motion to Compel Plaintiffs United States and Relator To Provide Adequate Responses to Abbott’s Discovery Requests <ul style="list-style-type: none"> June 1, 2007 – Memorandum by the United States in Opposition to Abbott’s Motion to Compel Adequate Responses to Abbott’s Discovery Requests June 1, 2007 – Ven-A-Care of the Florida Keys, Inc.’s Opposition Memorandum to Abbott

GOVERNMENT ENTITY CASES	MDL DOCKET NUMBER	ORIGINAL JURISDICTION	STATUS
<p>Ven-A-Care of the Florida Keys, et al. v. Abbott Laboratories, Inc. (continued)</p>			<p>Laboratories, Inc.'s Motion to Compel Plaintiffs United States and Relator to Provide Adequate Responses to Abbott's Discovery Requests</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • May 14, 2007 – Abbott Laboratories Inc.'s Motion for a Protective Order Barring the Deposition of its CEO, Miles White <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • May 24, 2007 – The United States' Opposition to Abbott Laboratories Inc.'s Motion for a Protective Order Barring the Deposition of Miles White • June 5, 2007 – Plaintiff Ven-A-Care's Motion for Leave to Amend Complaint by Adopting United States' First Amended Complaint • June 6, 2007 – Third-Party Hospira, Inc.'s Motion for a Protective Order and Motion to Quash Plaintiffs' Third Party Subpoenas to the Extent They Seek Hospira Information <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ June 20, 2007 – United States' Response to : (1) Third Party Hospira, Inc.'s Motion for a Protective Order and Motion to Quash Plaintiff's Third Party Subpoenas and (2) Defendant Abbott Laboratories Inc.'s Motion for a Protective Order and Motion to Quash Plaintiff's Third Party Subpoenas ○ June 20, 2007 – United States' Motion for Leave to File Under Seal Exhibits to Its Response to Third Parties TAP Pharmaceutical Products Inc.'s and Hospira, Inc.'s, and Defendant Abbott Laboratories, Inc.'s Motions for a Protective Order and Motions to Quash Plaintiff's Third Party Subpoenas • June 6, 2007 – Third-Party TAP Pharmaceutical Products Inc.'s Motion for a Protective Order and Motion to Quash Plaintiffs' Third Party Subpoenas <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ June 20, 2007 – United States' Response to Third-Party Pharmaceutical Product, Inc.'s Motion for a Protective Order and Motion to Quash Plaintiff's Third Party Subpoenas ○ June 20, 2007 – United States' Motion for Leave to File Under Seal Exhibits to Its Response to Third Parties TAP Pharmaceutical Products Inc.'s and Hospira, Inc.'s, and Defendant Abbott Laboratories, Inc.'s Motions for a Protective Order and Motions to Quash Plaintiff's Third Party Subpoenas • June 6, 2007 – Defendant Abbott Laboratories Inc.'s Motion for Protective Order and Motion to Quash Plaintiffs' Third-Party Subpoenas <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ June 20, 2007 – United States' Response to : (1) Third Party Hospira, Inc.'s Motion for a Protective Order and Motion to Quash Plaintiff's Third Party Subpoenas and (2) Defendant Abbott Laboratories Inc.'s Motion for a Protective Order and Motion to Quash Plaintiff's Third Party Subpoenas ○ June 20, 2007 – United States' Motion for Leave to File Under Seal Exhibits to Its

GOVERNMENT ENTITY CASES	MDL DOCKET NUMBER	ORIGINAL JURISDICTION	STATUS
Ven-A-Care of the Florida Keys, et al. v. Abbott Laboratories, Inc., et al., (continued)			<p>Response to Third Parties TAP Pharmaceutical Products Inc.'s and Hospira, Inc.'s, and Defendant Abbott Laboratories, Inc.'s Motions for a Protective Order and Motions to Quash Plaintiff's Third Party Subpoenas</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> June 27, 2007 – Second Unopposed Motion for Enlargement of Time to Respond to the United States' First Amended Complaint
Ven-A-Care of the Florida Keys, et al. v. Dey, Inc., et al., Case No. 05-11084	n/a	S.D. Fla.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> December 22, 2006 – Dey Defendants' Motion to Dismiss the U.S. Complaint <ul style="list-style-type: none"> February 2, 2007 – Relator's Opposition to Dey Defendants' Motion to Dismiss February 2, 2007 – United States' Memorandum in Opposition to Dey Defendants' Motion to Dismiss the United States' Complaint February 16, 2007 – Dey Defendants' Reply Memorandum in Further Support of Their Motion to Dismiss the United States' and Ven-A-Care's Complaints March 2, 2007 – United States' Sur-Reply Memorandum in Opposition to Dey Defendants' Motion to Dismiss the United States' Complaint March 2, 2007 – VAC's Sur-Reply Memorandum in Opposition to Dey's Motion to Dismiss June 8, 2007 – Dey Defendants' Memorandum of Law in Support of Certification for Immediate Appeal Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1292(b)
State of Florida, et al. v. Boehringer Ingelheim Corp., et al, Case No. 4:06- 476	n/a	Removed to N.D. Fla.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> November 28, 2006 – Final Transfer Order (33) transferring <i>State of Florida, et al. v. Boehringer Ingelheim Corp., et al.</i>, N.D. Fla., Case No. 4:06-476, to D. Mass. March 6, 2007 – Joinder in Dey, Inc.'s Notices of Removal by Defendants Boehringer Ingelheim Corp., Boehringer Ingelheim Pharmaceuticals, Inc., Boehringer Ingelheim Roxane, Inc., and Roxane Laboratories, Inc. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> March 12, 2007 – Response of the States of Florida, Illinois, Mississippi, and Florida Relator Ven-A-Care of the Florida Keys to Boehringer Ingelheim Defendants' Joinder in Dey, Inc.'s Removal Notice April 27, 2007 – Motion for Leave to File Notice of Supplemental Authority Relating to the Remand Motions of the States of Florida, Illinois, Mississippi, and Kentucky

GOVERNMENT ENTITY CASES	MDL DOCKET NUMBER	ORIGINAL JURISDICTION	STATUS
State of Arizona ex rel. v. Abbott Labs., Case No. 2:06-45	n/a	D. Ariz.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> August 11, 2006 – Plaintiff State of Arizona’s Motion for Remand <ul style="list-style-type: none"> August 25, 2006 – Memorandum in Support of Defendants’ Opposition to Plaintiff State of Arizona’s Motion for Remand October 24, 2006 – Order issued by Judge Patti B. Saris denying Motion to Remand to State Court October 25, 2006 – Electronic Notice from the Court to Reopen Document #2974 Motion to Remand to State Court November 9, 2006 – Defendant Dey, Inc.’s Supplemental Notice of Removal (<i>leave to file granted on November 2, 2006</i>) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> November 13, 2006 – Plaintiff State of Arizona’s Response to Defendant Dey, Inc.’s Supplemental Notice of Removal April 5, 2007 – Warrick Pharmaceuticals Corporation’s Motion for Reconsideration of the Court’s Order Relating to the Renewed Motion for Leave to Take the Deposition of Harvey Weintraub for Purposes of Discovery <ul style="list-style-type: none"> April 18, 2007 – State of Arizona’s Opposition to Warrick Pharmaceutical’s Motion for Reconsideration of the Order Regarding the Deposition of Harvey Weintraub
United States ex rel. Edward West v. Ortho McNeil Pharmaceutical, Inc. et al., Case No. 1:03-8239	n/a	N.D. Ill.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> December 20, 2006 – Order of Transfer with Simultaneous Separation and Remand June 11, 2007 – Defendants’ Motion to Dismiss the Complaint for Lack of Subject Matter Jurisdiction
State of Idaho v. Abbott Laboratories, Case No. 1:07-93	n/a	D. Idaho	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> May 2, 2007 – Order Lifting Stay of Conditional Transfer Order (36) transferring <i>State of Idaho v. Abbott Laboratories</i>, Case No. 1:07-93, to D. Mass
The People of the State of Illinois v. Abbott Labs., Case No. 1:06-5528	n/a	Removed to N.D. Ill.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> December 14, 2006 – Order Lifting Stay of Conditional Transfer Order (33) transferring <i>The People of the State of Illinois v. Abbott Laboratories, et al.</i>, N.D. Illinois, Case No. 1:06-5528 to D. Mass. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> November 27, 2006 – Notice of Opposition to proposed transfer filed January 25, 2007 – JPML Hearing Session to Consider CTO 33 and Possible Final Transfer Order March 6, 2007 – Joinder in Dey, Inc.’s Notices of Removal by Defendants Boehringer Ingelheim Corp., Boehringer Ingelheim Pharmaceuticals, Inc., Boehringer Ingelheim Roxane, Inc., and

GOVERNMENT ENTITY CASES	MDL DOCKET NUMBER	ORIGINAL JURISDICTION	STATUS
The People of the State of Illinois v. Abbott Labs., Case No. 1:06-5528 (continued)			<p>Roxane Laboratories, Inc.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> March 12, 2007 – Response of the States of Florida, Illinois, Mississippi, and Florida Relator Ven-A-Care of the Florida Keys to Boehringer Ingelheim Defendants’ Joinder in Dey, Inc.’s Removal Notice April 27, 2007 – Motion for Leave to File Notice of Supplemental Authority Relating to the Remand Motions of the States of Florida, Illinois, Mississippi, and Kentucky
Commonwealth of Kentucky ex rel. v. Warrick Pharmaceuticals Corp., et al., Case No. 3:06-69	n/a	Removed to E.D. Ky.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> January 19, 2007 – Final Transfer Order (33) transferring <i>Commonwealth of Kentucky ex rel. v. Warrick Pharmaceuticals Corp., et al.</i>, E.D. Ky., Case No. 3:06-69, to D. Mass. April 27, 2007 – Motion for Leave to File Notice of Supplemental Authority Relating to the Remand Motions of the States of Florida, Illinois, Mississippi, and Kentucky
State of Mississippi v. Abbott Laboratories, Inc., et al., Case No. 3:06-566	n/a	Removed to S.D. Miss.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> November 28, 2006 – Final Transfer Order (33) transferring <i>State of Mississippi v. Abbott Laboratories, Inc., et al.</i>, S.D. Miss., Case No. 3:06-566, to D. Mass. March 6, 2007 – Joinder in Dey, Inc.’s Notices of Removal by Defendants Boehringer Ingelheim Corp., Boehringer Ingelheim Pharmaceuticals, Inc., Boehringer Ingelheim Roxane, Inc., and Roxane Laboratories, Inc. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> March 12, 2007 – Response of the States of Florida, Illinois, Mississippi, and Florida Relator Ven-A-Care of the Florida Keys to Boehringer Ingelheim Defendants’ Joinder in Dey, Inc.’s Removal Notice April 27, 2007 – Motion for Leave to File Notice of Supplemental Authority Relating to the Remand Motions of the States of Florida, Illinois, Mississippi, and Kentucky

GOVERNMENT ENTITY CASES	MDL DOCKET NUMBER	ORIGINAL JURISDICTION	STATUS
State of Ohio v. Dey, Inc., et al., Case No. 1:06-676	n/a	Removed to S.D. Ohio	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> February 7, 2007 – Final Transfer Order (33) transferring <i>State of Ohio v. Dey, Inc., et al.</i>, S.D. Ohio, Case No. 1:06-676, to D. Mass. March 28, 2007 – Motion of State of Ohio to Lift Stay <ul style="list-style-type: none"> April 11, 2007 – Abbott Laboratories, Inc.’s Response to Motion of State of Ohio to Lift Stay March 6, 2007 – Joinder in Dey, Inc.’s Notices of Removal by Defendants Boehringer Ingelheim Corp., Boehringer Ingelheim Pharmaceuticals, Inc., Boehringer Ingelheim Roxane, Inc., and Roxane Laboratories, Inc. March 29, 2007 – Notice of Pending Motion to Remand Case to State Court
Commonwealth of Pennsylvania v. Tap Pharmaceutical Products, Case No. 2:06-4514	n/a	Removed to E.D. Pa.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> January 24, 2007 – Final Transfer Order (33) transferring <i>Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, etc. v. Tap Pharmaceutical Products, Inc., et al.</i>, E.D. Pennsylvania, Case No. 2:06-4514 to D.Mass. March 6, 2007 – Joinder in Dey, Inc.’s Notices of Removal by Defendants Boehringer Ingelheim Corp., Boehringer Ingelheim Pharmaceuticals, Inc., Boehringer Ingelheim Roxane, Inc., and Roxane Laboratories, Inc.
State of South Carolina et al. v. Abbott Laboratories, Inc., Case No. 3:06-2482	n/a	D.S.C.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> September 25, 2006 – Conditional Transfer Order (32) transferring <i>State of South Carolina v. Abbott Laboratories, Inc.</i>, D. South Carolina, Case No. 3:06-2482, to D. Mass. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> November 27, 2006 - Notice of opposition to proposed transfer filed
State of South Carolina, et al. v. Dey, LP, Case No. 3:06-2914	n/a	Removed to D.S.C.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> February 7, 2007 – Final Transfer Order (33) transferring <i>State of South Carolina, et al. v. Dey, LP</i>, D. South Carolina, Case No. 3:06-2914, to D. Mass.
State of South Carolina, et al. v. Dey, LP, Case No. 3:06-2925	n/a	Removed to D.S.C.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> February 7, 2007 – Final Transfer Order (33) transferring <i>State of South Carolina, et al. v. Dey, LP</i>, D. South Carolina, Case No. 3:06-2925, to D. Mass.

GOVERNMENT ENTITY CASES	MDL DOCKET NUMBER	ORIGINAL JURISDICTION	STATUS
County of Schenectady v. Abbott Laboratories, Inc., et al., CA No. 06-1239	n/a	Removed to N.D.N.Y.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> February 7, 2007 – Final Transfer Order (33) transferring <i>County of Schenectady v. Abbott Laboratories, Inc., et al.</i>, N.D. New York, CA No. 06-1239, to D. Mass. March 6, 2007 – Joinder in Dey, Inc.’s Notices of Removal by Defendants Boehringer Ingelheim Corp., Boehringer Ingelheim Pharmaceuticals, Inc., Boehringer Ingelheim Roxane, Inc., and Roxane Laboratories, Inc. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> April 4, 2007 – Response of Plaintiffs County of Erie, County of Oswego and County of Schenectady to Boehringer Ingelheim Defendants’ Joinder in Dey, Inc.’s Removal Notices March 20, 2007 – Motion of Plaintiffs County of Eerie, County of Oswego, and County of Schenectady for a Hearing Regarding Their Motions to Remand
County of Oswego v. Abbott Laboratories, Inc., et al., CA No. 06-1240	n/a	Removed to N.D.N.Y.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> February 7, 2007 – Final Transfer Order (33) transferring <i>County of Oswego v. Abbott Laboratories, Inc., et al.</i>, N.D. New York, CA No. 06-1240, to D. Mass. March 6, 2007 – Joinder in Dey, Inc.’s Notices of Removal by Defendants Boehringer Ingelheim Corp., Boehringer Ingelheim Pharmaceuticals, Inc., Boehringer Ingelheim Roxane, Inc., and Roxane Laboratories, Inc. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> April 4, 2007 – Response of Plaintiffs County of Erie, County of Oswego and County of Schenectady to Boehringer Ingelheim Defendants’ Joinder in Dey, Inc.’s Removal Notices March 20, 2007 – Motion of Plaintiffs County of Eerie, County of Oswego, and County of Schenectady for a Hearing Regarding Their Motions to Remand
County of Erie v. Abbott Laboratories, Inc., et al., CA No. 06-6505	n/a	Removed to W.D.N.Y.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> February 7, 2007 – Final Transfer Order (33) transferring <i>The County of Erie v. Abbott Laboratories, Inc., et al.</i>, W.D. New York, CA No. 06-6505, to D. Mass. March 6, 2007 – Joinder in Dey, Inc.’s Notices of Removal by Defendants Boehringer Ingelheim Corp., Boehringer Ingelheim Pharmaceuticals, Inc., Boehringer Ingelheim Roxane, Inc., and Roxane Laboratories, Inc. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> April 4, 2007 – Response of Plaintiffs County of Erie, County of Oswego and County of Schenectady to Boehringer Ingelheim Defendants’ Joinder in Dey, Inc.’s Removal Notices March 20, 2007 – Motion of Plaintiffs County of Eerie, County of Oswego, and County of Schenectady for a Hearing Regarding Their Motions to Remand
The County of Orange v. Abbott Laboratories, Inc., et al., CA No. 07-2777	n/a	S.D.N.Y.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> April 18, 2007 - Conditional Transfer Order (38) transferring <i>The County of Orange v. Abbott Laboratories, Inc., et al.</i>, Case No. 1:07-2777, to D. Mass.

GOVERNMENT ENTITY CASES	MDL DOCKET NUMBER	ORIGINAL JURISDICTION	STATUS
Consolidated County Case (Civil Action No. 01-CV-12257-PBS): City of New York (S.D.N.Y.) County of Albany (N.D.N.Y.) County of Allegany (W.D.N.Y.) County of Broome (N.D.N.Y.) County of Cattaraugus (W.D.N.Y.) County of Cayuga (N.D.N.Y.) County of Chautauqua (W.D.N.Y.) County of Chemung (W.D.N.Y.) County of Chenango (N.D.N.Y.) County of Columbia (N.D.N.Y.) County of Cortland (N.D.N.Y.) County of Dutchess (S.D.N.Y.) County of Essex (N.D.N.Y.) County of Fulton (N.D.N.Y.) County of Genesee (W.D.N.Y.) County of Greene (N.D.N.Y.) County of Herkimer (N.D.N.Y.) County of Jefferson (N.D.N.Y.) County of Lewis (N.D.N.Y.) County of Madison (N.D.N.Y.) County of Monroe (W.D.N.Y.) County of Nassau (E.D.N.Y.) County of Niagara (W.D.N.Y.) County of Oneida (N.D.N.Y.) County of Onondaga (N.D.N.Y.) County of Ontario (W.D.N.Y.) County of Orleans (W.D.N.Y.) County of Putnam (S.D.N.Y.) County of Rensselaer (N.D.N.Y.) County of Rockland (S.D.N.Y.) County of St. Lawrence (N.D.N.Y.) County of Saratoga (N.D.N.Y.) County of Schuyler (W.D.N.Y.) County of Seneca (W.D.N.Y.) County of Steuben (W.D.N.Y.) County of Suffolk (E.D.N.Y.)	n/a	E.D.N.Y. N.D.N.Y. S.D.N.Y. W.D.N.Y.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> March 30, 2005 – County of Suffolk’s Motion to Renew Its Second Motion to Compel the Production of Discovery From the Schering-Plough Corporation <i>sub judice</i> (Magistrate Judge Bowler) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> April 6, 2005 – Schering Plough’s Opposition to County of Suffolk’s Motion to Renew Its Second Motion to Compel the Production of Discovery March 3, 2006 – Individual Memoranda of Each Defendant in Support of Its Motion to Dismiss (1) the Consolidated Complaint of New York City and Plaintiff Counties Other than Nassau and (2) the Second Amended Complaint of Nassau County (<i>individual memoranda filed by Bayer Corp., Sanofi-Synthelabo, Forest Labs., Inc./Forest Pharmaceuticals, Inc., Amgen, Inc., Pfizer Defendants, TAP Pharmaceutical Prods., Inc., Biogen Idec Inc., Wyeth, Novartis Pharmaceuticals Corp., EMD, Inc., Mylan Defendants, AstraZeneca Defendants, Endo Pharmaceuticals, Roche Defendants, Boehringer Ingelheim Corp., MedImmune, Inc., Merck & Co., Inc., Sandoz Inc., Ben Venue Labs., Inc., Par Pharmaceuticals, Boehringer Ingelheim Corp.</i>) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> April 17, 2006 – Plaintiffs’ Opposition to Defendants’ Individual Memorandum in Support of Motion to Dismiss (1) the Consolidated Complaint of New York City and Plaintiff Counties Other than Nassau and (2) the Second Amended Complaint of Nassau County April 24, 2006 – Plaintiffs’ Opposition to Individual Memoranda of Law in Support of Motion to Dismiss Filed by Eli Lilly & Co., Purdue Pharma LP, Chiron Corp. May 11, 2006 – Individual Reply Memoranda of Each Defendant in Further Support of Its Motion to Dismiss (1) the Consolidated Complaint of New York City and Plaintiff Counties Other than Nassau and (2) the Second Amended Complaint of Nassau County (<i>individual memoranda filed by Forest Labs., Inc./Forest Pharmaceuticals, Inc., Amgen Inc., Aventis Pharmaceuticals, Biogen Idec Inc., Endo Pharmaceuticals Inc., Eli Lilly and Co., Wyeth, The Roche Defendants, Merck & Co., Bayer Corp., Pfizer Defendants, Sanofi-Synthelabo, Mylan Defendants, Boehringer Ingelheim, Ben Venue Labs., Inc., Purdue Pharma LP/Purdue Frederick Co./Purdue Pharma Co., AstraZeneca, EMD, Inc., Sandoz Inc., Novartis Pharmaceuticals Corp., MedImmune, Inc., Par Pharmaceuticals, Inc.</i>) June 2, 2006 – Plaintiffs’ Joint Sur-Reply in Further Opposition to Defendants’ Individual Motions to Dismiss September 19, 2006 – Notice of Filing of Brief of the Attorney General of the State of New York as Amicus Curiae October 12, 2006 – Defendants’ Response to the Brief of the Attorney General of the State of New York as Amicus Curiae and to Plaintiffs’ Post-Oral Argument Submissions November 1, 2006 – Plaintiffs’ Notice of Supplemental Authority In Further Opposition to Merck’s Motion to Dismiss December 22, 2006 – Memorandum of Merck & Co., Inc., in Response to Plaintiffs’ “Notice of Supplemental Authority In Opposition to Merck’s Motion to Dismiss” (leave to

GOVERNMENT ENTITY CASES	MDL DOCKET NUMBER	ORIGINAL JURISDICTION	STATUS
<p>County of Tompkins (N.D.N.Y.) County of Ulster (N.D.N.Y.), County of Warren (N.D.N.Y.) County of Washington (N.D.N.Y.) County of Wayne (W.D.N.Y.) County of Westchester (S.D.N.Y.) County of Wyoming (W.D.N.Y.) County of Yates (W.D.N.Y.)</p>			<p>file granted on December 20, 2006)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ February 9, 2007 – Notice of Supplemental Authority in Further Opposition to Defendants’ Motion to Dismiss the Consolidated Complaint of New York City and New York Counties Other than Nassau ○ February 23, 2007 – Captioned Plaintiffs’ Memorandum in Opposition to Merck’s Motion for Leave to File Memorandum in Response to Plaintiffs’ “Notice of Supplemental Authority in Opposition to Merck’s Motion to Dismiss” ○ June 22, 2007 – Defendant Chiron Corporation’s Renewed Motion to Dismiss the Consolidated New York City and New York Counties First Amended Consolidated Complaint ○ June 22, 2007 – Eli Lilly and Company’s Renewed Motion to Dismiss the New York Counties’ First Amended Consolidated Complaint on the Ground that It Previously was Dismissed from this Case Pursuant to the Court’s “Suffolk 13” Decision ○ June 22, 2007 – Ivax Corporation, Ivax Pharmaceuticals, Inc. and Barr Laboratories, Inc.’s Joint Renewed Motion to Dismiss the New York Counties’ First Amended Consolidated Complaint on the Ground that They were Previously Dismissed from this Case Pursuant to the Court’s “Suffolk 13” Decision ○ June 22, 2007 – Defendant Endo Pharmaceuticals Inc.’s Renewal of Its Individual Motion to Dismiss the Consolidated Complaint of New York City and Plaintiff New York Counties Other than Nassau ○ June 22, 2007 – Amgen Inc.’s Renewed Motion to Dismiss the New York Counties’ Complaint ○ June 22, 2007 – Motion to Renew Individual Memorandum of Defendants Purdue Pharma L.P., Purdue Frederick Company and Purdue Pharma Company’s in Support of Their Motion to Dismiss the New York Counties’ First Amended Consolidated Complaint ○ June 22, 2007 – TAP Pharmaceutical Products Inc.’s Motion to Renew Supplemental Motion to Dismiss and Reassert Reply Memorandum to Plaintiffs’ Response to Motion to Dismiss ○ June 22, 2007 – Motion to Renew Separate Memorandum of Defendant Boehringer Ingelheim Corporation in Support of Its Motion to Dismiss ○ June 22, 2007 – Defendant Bayer Corporation’s Notice of Its Renewal of Its Pending Individual Motion to Dismiss in Response to Plaintiffs’ First Amended Consolidated Complaint ○ June 22, 2007 – Defendant Wyeth’s Renewal of Its Motion to Dismiss the Complaint Filed by New York City and the New York Counties, Including Nassau County <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • June 22, 2007 – Defendants Joint Motion to Dismiss Plaintiffs’ First Amended Consolidated Complaint

MDL 1456 STATUS CHART – PRIVATE CLASS CASES

PRIVATE CLASS CASES	MDL DOCKET NO.	ORIGINAL JURISDICTION	STATUS
Master Consolidated Class Action	Master File 01-CV-12257-PBS	D. Mass. pursuant to JPML Order	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> May 3, 2004 – Plaintiffs’ Motion to Compel the Production of Documents Created During the Relevant Time Period from Defendants Abbott Laboratories, AstraZeneca, Schering Plough, Sicor and Together Rx Defendants <i>sub judice</i> (Magistrate Judge Bowler) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> May 17, 2004 – Certain Defendants’ Notice of Opposition to Plaintiffs’ Motion to Compel the Production of Certain Documents and Consent Motion for an Extension of Time May 26, 2004 – Notice of Withdrawal of Plaintiffs’ Motion to Compel the Production of Documents Created During the Relevant Time Period Directed at Defendant Schering–Plough (<i>Note: withdrawal applies only to Schering-Plough</i>) May 27, 2004 – Consent Motion for an Extension of Time to Oppose the Motion to Compel May 27, 2004 – Opposition of the Together Rx Defendants to Plaintiffs’ Motion to Compel the Production of Documents May 28, 2004 – Notice of Withdrawal of Plaintiffs’ Motion to Compel the Production of Documents Created During the Relevant Time Period Directed at Defendant Abbott Laboratories (<i>Note: withdrawal applies only to Abbott Laboratories</i>) June 8, 2004 – Notice of Withdrawal of Plaintiffs’ Motion to Compel the Production of Documents Created During the Relevant Time Period Directed at Defendant AstraZeneca. (<i>Note: withdrawal applies only to AstraZeneca</i>) June 9, 2004 – Plaintiffs’ Reply Memorandum in Support of Motion to Compel the Production of Documents Created During the Relevant Time Period from the Together Rx Defendants June 22, 2004 – Order granting Plaintiffs’ Motion to Withdraw Motion to Compel Directed at Abbott Laboratories Awaiting scheduling of hearing or ruling by Court as to Together Rx Defendants February 23, 2005 – Third Party Schaller Anderson Inc.’s Objection and Motion to Quash Plaintiffs’ Subpoena June 14, 2005 – Defendant Sicor Inc. and Sicor Pharmaceuticals, Inc.’s Motion for Protective Order with Memorandum in Support <i>sub judice</i> (Magistrate Judge Bowler)

PRIVATE CLASS CASES	MDL DOCKET NO.	ORIGINAL JURISDICTION	STATUS
Master Consolidated Class Action (continued)			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ June 28, 2005 – Plaintiffs’ Response to Sicor’s Motion for Protective Order ○ July 7, 2005 – Motion for Leave to File Reply to Plaintiffs’ Response to Sicor’s Motion for Protective Order • November 9, 2005 – Plaintiffs’ Motion for Order Exempting Defendant Abbott Laboratories from Any Order Refusing to Extend Deadline for Track Two Discovery <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ November 23, 2005 – Defendant Abbott Laboratories’ Opposition to Plaintiffs’ Motion for Order Exempting Defendant Abbott Laboratories from Any Order Declining to Extend Deadline for Track Two Discovery ○ December 1, 2005 – Plaintiffs’ Letter to Magistrate Judge Bowler Requesting Postponement of Hearing until Track Two Discovery Issues Resolved • November 28, 2005 – Plaintiffs’ Motion for Clarification of Case Management Order #16 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ November 30, 2005 – Response of Defendant Watson Pharma, Inc. to Plaintiffs’ “Motion for Clarification of Case Management Order #16” ○ November 30, 2005 – Certain Track II Defendants’ Request for Expedited Hearing ○ December 1, 2005 – Order re: Plaintiffs’ Motion for Clarification of Case Management Order #16 ○ December 9, 2005 – Track II Defendants’ Submission Regarding Discovery Schedule ○ December 9, 2005 – Watson Pharmaceuticals, Inc.’s Response to Court Order Regarding Discovery Schedule ○ December 9, 2005 – Defendants Baxter Healthcare Corporation and Baxter International Inc.’s Memorandum Regarding Track II Discovery Schedule ○ December 9, 2005 – Plaintiffs’ Memorandum in Support of Their Proposed Track II Discovery Schedule ○ December 15, 2005 – Plaintiffs’ Reply to Watson Pharmaceuticals, Inc.’s Response to Court Order Regarding Discovery Schedule ○ December 16, 2005 – Watson Pharmaceuticals, Inc.’s Motion for Leave to File Reply Memorandum in Support of Its Response to Court Order Regarding Discovery Schedule

PRIVATE CLASS CASES	MDL DOCKET NO.	ORIGINAL JURISDICTION	STATUS
Master Consolidated Class Action (continued)			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • February 16, 2006 – Dey, Inc.’s and Abbott Laboratories’ Objections to the Order of Chief Magistrate Judge Bowler Issued on February 4, 2006 Pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. Rule 72(a) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ February 22, 2006 – Plaintiffs’ Assented-to Motion for Leave to Reply to Dey, Inc.’s and Abbott Laboratories’ Objections to the Order of Chief Magistrate Judge Bowler Issued on February 4, 2006 to File Such Reply Until March 8, 2006 ○ March 8, 2006 – Plaintiffs’ Opposition to Dey, Inc.’s and Abbott Laboratories’ Objections to Chief Magistrate Judge Bowler’s Order Denying Further Discovery of Massachusetts Health Plans ○ March 8, 2006 – Plaintiffs’ Motion for Leave to File Plaintiffs’ Opposition to Dey, Inc.’s and Abbott Laboratories’ Objections to Chief Magistrate Judge Bowler’s Order Denying Further Discovery of Massachusetts Health Plans • February 21, 2006 – UnitedHealthcare, Inc. and United HealthCare Insurance Co.’s Limited Objections to Magistrate Judge’s Order Granting Defendants’ Motion to Compel <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ March 10, 2006 – Defendants’ Response to Third Party UnitedHealthcare, Inc. and United HealthCare Insurance Company’s Objections to Chief Magistrate Judge Bowler’s Order Granting Defendants’ Motion to Compel • May 8, 2006 – Plaintiffs’ Motion to Certify Claims with Respect to Track 2 Defendants <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ May 16, 2006 – Plaintiffs’ Motion for Leave to Join Harold Bean as a Plaintiff and a Proposed Class Representative <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ May 19, 2006 – Track Two Defendants’ Opposition to Plaintiffs’ Motion for Leave to Join Harold Bean as a Plaintiff and Class Representative ▪ May 24, 2006 – Warrick Pharmaceuticals Corp.’s Opposition to Plaintiffs’ Motion for Leave to Join Harold Bean as a Plaintiff and Class Representative ○ May 16, 2006 – Track Two Defendants’ Motion to Strike Harold Bean as a Proposed Class Representative <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ May 26, 2006 – Plaintiffs’ Memorandum in Opposition to Motion to Strike Harold Bean as a Proposed Class Representative

PRIVATE CLASS CASES	MDL DOCKET NO.	ORIGINAL JURISDICTION	STATUS
Master Consolidated Class Action (continued)			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ June 15, 2006 – Defendants’ Individual Memoranda of Law in Opposition to Track 2 Class Certification (<i>individual memorandum filed by each of the Track 2 Defendants</i>) (Redacted versions filed in last week of June/first week of July 2006) ○ July 19, 2006 – Plaintiffs’ Reply Memorandum in Support of Motion to Certify Claims With Respect to Track 2 Defendants ○ August 4, 2006 – Track Two Proposal Concerning the Appointment of a Neutral Expert to Advise the Court on Track Two Class Certification ○ August 7, 2006 – Plaintiffs’ Response to Track Two Proposal Concerning the Appointment of a Neutral Expert to Advise the Court on Track Two Class Certification ○ August 25, 2006 – Track Two Defendants’ Memorandum in Opposition to Class Certification ○ August 25, 2006 – Track Two Defendants’ Memorandum Regarding Harold Bean, in Further Opposition to Class Certification ○ September 5, 2006 – Plaintiff’s Response to Track 2 Defendants’ Memorandum Regarding Harold Bean ○ September 7, 2006 – Track Two Defendants’ Notice of Supplemental Evidence Relevant to Class Certification ○ September 11, 2006 – Track Two Defendants’ Supplemental Filing Regarding the Track Two Defendants’ Motion for Leave to File the Rebuttal Declaration of Steven J. Young in Support of Track 2 Defendants’ Opposition to Class Certification or, in the Alternative, Motion to Strike the Hartman Track 2 Dyckman Rebuttal, Hartman Track 2 Young Rebuttal and the Rosenthal Rebuttal) ○ September 11, 2006 – Track Two Defendants’ Notice of Supplemental Authority Relevant to Class Certification ○ October 16, 2006 – Class Plaintiffs’ Submission of the “Generics Chart” Pursuant to the Oral Request of the Court During the Class Certification Hearing in Connection with Track 2 (corrected October 17, 2006) ○ December 21, 2006 – Track Two Defendants’ Motion to Strike the “Generics Chart” and Proposed Track Two Class Certification Order Submitted by Plaintiffs’ in Support of Their Motion for Class Certification <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • June 22, 2006 – Plaintiffs’ Motion to Quash May 18, 2006 Amended Notice of Deposition of Harvey Weintraub Filed by Defendant Warrick

PRIVATE CLASS CASES	MDL DOCKET NO.	ORIGINAL JURISDICTION	STATUS
Master Consolidated Class Action (continued)			<p>Pharmaceuticals Corporation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ June 22, 2006 – Plaintiffs’ Motion for Leave to File Under Seal Plaintiffs’ Memorandum and Exhibit 1 to the Declaration of Steve W. Berman in Support of Motion to Quash May 18, 2006 Amended Notice of Deposition of Harvey Weintraub Filed by Defendant Warrick Pharmaceuticals Corporation ○ July 6, 2006 – Warrick’s Memorandum in Opposition to Certain Plaintiffs’ Motion to Quash May 18, 2006 Amended Notice of Deposition of Harvey Weintraub and in Support of Cross Motion for Leave to Take Deposition of Harvey Weintraub for Purposes of Preservation of Testimony ○ July 20, 2006 – Plaintiffs’ Memorandum in Opposition to Warrick Pharmaceuticals Corporation’s Cross-Motion for Leave to Take the Deposition of Harvey Weintraub for Purposes of Preservation of Testimony ○ August 3, 2006 – Warrick Pharmaceuticals Corporation’s Reply Memorandum in Support of Its Cross Motion for Leave to Take the Deposition of Harvey Weintraub for Purposes of Preservation of Testimony <p>• October 3, 2006 – Plaintiffs’ Disclosures Pursuant to the Court’s Amended Pretrial Order of August 21, 2006</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ October 9, 2006 – Plaintiffs’ Amended Disclosures Pursuant to the Court’s Amended Pretrial Order of August 21, 2006 ○ October 11, 2006 – Corrected Plaintiffs’ Amended Disclosures Pursuant to the Court’s Amended Pretrial Order of August 21, 2006 ○ October 17, 2006 – Track 1 Defendants’ Objections to Plaintiffs’ Proposed Exhibits ○ October 27, 2006 – Plaintiffs’ Second Amended Disclosures Pursuant to the Court’s Amended Pretrial Order of August 21, 2006 ○ November 2, 2006 – Plaintiffs’ Supplemental Pretrial Disclosures Pursuant to the Court’s Amended Pretrial Order of August 21, 2006 ○ November 3, 2006 – Track 1 Defendants’ Revised and Supplemental Objections to Plaintiffs’ Supplemented Proposed Exhibits ○ December 5, 2006 – Plaintiffs’ Supplemental Pretrial Disclosures Pursuant to the Court’s Amended Pretrial Order of August 21, 2006 as to Exhibits ○ December 15, 2006 – Plaintiffs’ Second Supplemental Pretrial Disclosures Pursuant to the Court’s Amended Pretrial Order of

PRIVATE CLASS CASES	MDL DOCKET NO.	ORIGINAL JURISDICTION	STATUS
Master Consolidated Class Action (continued)			<p>August 21, 2006 as to Exhibits</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • October 10, 2006 – Track 1 Defendants’ Joint Pretrial Disclosures Pursuant to Fed R. Civ. P. 26(a)(3)(A) – Exhibit List (<i>individual lists filed by AstraZeneca, BMS, Johnson & Johnson, Schering-Plough Corporation and Warrick Pharmaceuticals Corporation</i>) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ October 17, 2006 – Defendants Bristol-Myers Squibb Co. and Oncology Therapeutics Network Corp.’s Amended Pretrial Disclosures ○ October 19, 2006 – Schering-Plough Corporation’s and Warrick Pharmaceuticals Corporation’s Amended Pretrial Disclosures Pursuant to Fed R. Civ. P. 26(a)(3)(A) ○ October 23, 2006 – The J&J Defendants’ Amended Individual Disclosures Pursuant to Fed R. Civ. P. 26(a)(3)(A) ○ October 24, 2006 – Track 1 Defendants’ Joint Amended Pretrial Disclosures Pursuant to Fed R. Civ. P. 26(a)(3)(A) – Amended Exhibit List ○ October 24, 2006 – Plaintiffs’ Objections to Track 1 Defendants’ Joint Exhibit List ○ October 24, 2006 – Plaintiffs’ Objections to Defendant AstraZeneca Pharmaceuticals LP’s Exhibit List ○ October 24, 2006 – Plaintiffs’ Objections to Defendants Bristol-Myers Squibb Co. and Oncology Therapeutics Network Corp.’s Amended Pretrial Disclosures ○ October 24, 2006 – Plaintiffs’ Objections to the J&J Defendants’ Amended Individual Disclosures Pursuant to Fed R. Civ. P. 26(a)(3)(A) ○ October 24, 2006 – Plaintiffs’ Objections to Schering-Plough Corporation’s and Warrick Pharmaceuticals Corporation’s Amended Pretrial Disclosures Pursuant to Fed R. Civ. P. 26(a)(3)(A) ○ October 25, 2006 – Schering-Plough Corporation’s and Warrick Pharmaceuticals Corporation’s Second Amended Pretrial Disclosures Pursuant to Fed R. Civ. P. 26(a)(3)(A) ○ November 2, 2006 – Track 1 Defendants’ Joint Second Amended Pretrial Disclosures Pursuant to Fed R. Civ. P. 26(a)(3)(A) ○ November 3, 2006 – Track 1 Defendants’ Joint Supplemental Pretrial Disclosures Pursuant to Fed R. Civ. P. 26(a)(3)(A) ○ November 6, 2006 – Schering-Plough Corporation’s and Warrick Pharmaceuticals Corporation’s Supplemental Pretrial Disclosures

PRIVATE CLASS CASES	MDL DOCKET NO.	ORIGINAL JURISDICTION	STATUS
Master Consolidated Class Action (continued)			<p>Pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 26(a)(3)(A)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ November 19, 2006 – Track 1 Defendants’ Second Joint Supplemental Pretrial Disclosures Pursuant to Fed R. Civ. P. 26(a)(3)(A) as to Exhibits ○ December 20, 2006 – Schering’s and Warrick’s Supplemental List of Trial Exhibits ○ January 11, 2007 – Schering’s and Warrick’s Second Supplemental List of Trial Exhibits <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • November 2, 2006 – Defendant Immunex Corporation’s Objections to October 23, 2006 Order by Chief Magistrate Judge Bowler Regarding Immunex’s Motion for Protective Order Regarding May 17, 2006, Deposition Notice <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ November 9, 2006 – Plaintiffs’ Memorandum In Response to Immunex Corporation’s Objections to October 23, 2006 Order by Chief Magistrate Judge Bowler Denying Immunex’s Motion for Protective Order • November 6, 2006 – Plaintiffs’ Objections to the October 23, 2006 Order by Chief Magistrate Bowler Re: Amgen Inc.’s Motion for Protective Order Relating to Plaintiffs’ Rule 30(b)(6) Deposition Notice Regarding Sales and Marketing <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ November 14, 2006 – Amgen Inc.’s Response to Plaintiffs’ Objections to Chief Magistrate Judge Bowler’s October 23, 2006 Order Granting Amgen Inc.’s Motion for Protective Order • December 19, 2006 – Track 1 Defendants’ Request for Admission of Trial Exhibits <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ December 26, 2006 – Plaintiffs’ Objections to Track 1 Defendants’ December 19th Request for Admission of Trial Exhibits ○ January 12, 2007 – Track 1 Defendants’ (1) Response to Plaintiffs’ Objections to Defendants’ December 19th Request for Admission of Trial Exhibits and (2) Opposition to Plaintiffs’ January 4th Request for Admission of Trial Exhibits ○ January 19, 2007 – Plaintiffs’ Supplemental Objections to Track 1 Defendants’ December 19th Request for Admission of Trial Exhibits ○ June 28, 2007 – Order by Judge Saris Granting Admission of Trial Exhibit 2001 and Denying Admission of Trial Exhibits 1081, 1656, 2969, 2970 and 2971

PRIVATE CLASS CASES	MDL DOCKET NO.	ORIGINAL JURISDICTION	STATUS
Master Consolidated Class Action (continued)			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • January 4, 2007 – Plaintiffs’ Request for Admission of Trial Exhibits <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ January 12, 2007 – Track 1 Defendants’ (1) Response to Plaintiffs’ Objections to Defendants’ December 19th Request for Admission of Trial Exhibits and (2) Opposition to Plaintiffs’ January 4th Request for Admission of Trial Exhibits ○ January 19, 2007 – Plaintiffs’ Supplemental Request for Admission of Trial Exhibits ○ January 26, 2007 – Track 1 Defendants’ Opposition to Plaintiffs’ Supplemental Request for Admission of Trial Exhibits ○ February 1, 2007 – Plaintiffs’ Memorandum in Support of Supplemental Request for Admission of Trial Exhibits ○ June 28, 2007 – Order by Judge Saris Granting Admission of Trial Exhibits 15, 17, 19, 43, 47, 255, 256, 330, 409, 421, 422, 425, 433, 441, 453, 455, 466, 471, 503, 504, 523, 612, 709, 866, 953, 954, 955, 956 and 4109 and Denying Admission of Trial Exhibits 257, 258, 381, 469, 470, 478, 497, 501, 502, 559, 572, 618, 913 and 915 • February 22, 2007 – Plaintiffs’ Objections to February 12, 2007 Order by Magistrate Judge Bowler Granting Defendant Abbott Laboratories’ Motion for Protective Order and Motion to Quash Plaintiffs’ Third Party Subpoenas <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ March 8, 2007 - Abbott Laboratories Response to Plaintiffs’ Objections to February 12, 2007 Order by Magistrate Judge Bowler Granting Defendant Abbott Laboratories’ Motion for Protective Order and Motion to Quash Plaintiffs’ Third Party Subpoenas ○ March 23, 2007 – Plaintiffs’ Reply Brief in Support of Their Objections to February 12, 2007 Order by Magistrate Judge Bowler Granting Defendant Abbott Laboratories’ Motion for Protective Order and Motion to Quash Plaintiffs’ Third Party Subpoenas • March 22, 2007 - Declaration of G. Raymond Pironti, Jr. Regarding Time Expended for Preparing Direct Testimony via Declaration and Traveling from Tampa, Florida to Boston Pursuant to Subpoena to Appear for Trial Testimony and Request for Reimbursement • April 26, 2007 – Class Plaintiffs’ Motion for Leave to File an Amended Complaint <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ May 10, 2007 – Track Two Defendants’ Opposition to Class

PRIVATE CLASS CASES	MDL DOCKET NO.	ORIGINAL JURISDICTION	STATUS
Master Consolidated Class Action (continued)			<p>Plaintiffs' Motion for Leave to File An Amended Complaint</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ May 10, 2007 – BMS Defendants' Memorandum in Opposition to Plaintiffs' Motion for Leave to File a Fifth Amended Master Consolidated Class Action Complaint ○ June 12, 2007 – Class Plaintiffs' Corrected Reply Memorandum in Support of Motion for Leave to File Amended Complaint <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • May 21, 2007 – Renewed Motion for Amendment of Case Management Order No. 1 and Consolidated Order Re: Motion for Class Certification <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ June 6, 2007 – Response of Plaintiffs' Court Appointed Co-Lead Counsel to Renewed Motion for Amended Case Management Order No. 1 • June 11, 2007 – Plaintiffs' Motion in Limine to Preclude Introduction of Evidence Regarding Purported "Knowledge" of Third-Party Payors • June 11, 2007 – Plaintiffs' Motion in Limine to Preclude Introduction of Evidence Regarding the Government's Purported "Knowledge" • June 11, 2007 – Plaintiffs' Motion in Limine to Preclude Introduction of Evidence Regarding BMS Patient Assistance Programs • June 11, 2007 – Plaintiffs' Motion in Limine to Preclude Introduction of Evidence Regarding AMP and IMS Data • June 11, 2007 – Plaintiffs' Disclosures for Class 1 BMS Trial • June 11, 2007 – Plaintiffs' Deposition Designations of Sworn Testimony for Bristol-Myers Squibb Trial • June 11, 2007 – BMS's Motion in Limine to Preclude Dr. Harman from Testifying About Matters not Disclosed in His Prior Reports • June 11, 2007 – BMS's Motion in Limine to Exclude All Evidence Relating to Apothecon Inc. • June 11, 2007 – BMS's Motion in Limine to Exclude the 2003 Office of Inspector General Guidance

PRIVATE CLASS CASES	MDL DOCKET NO.	ORIGINAL JURISDICTION	STATUS
Master Consolidated Class Action (continued)			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • June 11, 2007 – BMS’s Motion in Limine to Exclude Evidence of Wealth from the Liability Phase of the Trial and for a Separate Trial as to Punitive Damages • June 11, 2007 – BMS’s Motion in Limine to Exclude Plaintiffs’ Exhibits or Testimony Relating to the Alleged Misconduct of Other Pharmaceutical Companies • June 11, 2007 – BMS’s Motion in Limine to Exclude Evidence Relating to Settlements or Guilty Pleas in Other Cases • June 11, 2007 – BMS’s Motion in Limine to Exclude Testimony and Evidence Concerning Aggregate Damages • June 11, 2007 – BMS’s Motion in Limine to Preclude Any Reference to the Court’s Plain Meaning Opinion Until Instruction of the Jury • June 11, 2007 – BMS’s Motion in Limine to Exclude All Evidence Relating to BMS Multi-Source Drugs • June 11, 2007 – Pretrial Disclosures of Defendants Bristol-Myers Squibb Co. and Oncology Therapeutics Network Corp. for Class 1 Trial • June 11, 2007 – Deposition and Trial Testimony Designations of Defendants Bristol-Myers Squibb Co. and Oncology Therapeutics Network Corp. for Class 1 Trial • June 21, 2007 – Plaintiffs’ Motion to Continue the Stay, with Baxter’s Consent and with Respect to Defendant Baxter Healthcare Corporation and Baxter International Inc. Only, the Class Case and Montana and Nevada Cases • June 22, 2007 – Class Plaintiffs’ Motion for Final Approval of Proposed Nationwide Class Settlement with GlaxoSmithKline <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ June 22, 2007 – Objection of Demra Jordan ○ June 22, 2007 – Health Care Service Corporation’s Statement of Objections to Terms of the Proposed Settlement

PRIVATE CLASS CASES	MDL DOCKET NO.	ORIGINAL JURISDICTION	STATUS
Master Consolidated Class Action (continued)			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • June 22, 2007 – Class Counsel’s Petition for Attorneys’ Fees, Reimbursement of Expenses, and Compensation to the Name Plaintiffs <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ June 22, 2007 – Heins Mills & Olson, P.L.C.’s Petition for Attorney Fees and Reimbursement of Expenses ○ June 29, 2007 – Response of the Class 1 Class Representative, Reverend David Aaronson, to the Recommendation of Class Counsel Respecting Compensation to Named Plaintiffs ○ June 29, 2007 – Motion to File Under Seal Exhibit A to Declaration of Donald E. Haviland, Jr. in Support of the Haviland Law Firm, LLC’s Petition for Attorneys’ Fees and Reimbursement of Expenses in Relation to Settlement with GlaxoSmithKline ○ June 29, 2007 – Memorandum in Support of the Haviland Law Firm, LLC’s Petition for an Award of Attorney Fees and Expenses Out of the Proceeds of the GlaxoSmithKline Settlement